



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

inattentive proof-reading ; in other instances, as in the matter of the palisade at Hastings, the relation of the Roman and the Christian basilica, and the dates of the Merovingian kings, recent research has not been sufficiently regarded ; but in far too many cases the fault is due to loose and careless habits of statement. Conformity to good usage in the spelling of proper names is highly desirable in a text-book, and while the influence of the archaistic revival still delays the adoption of a uniform English practice in these matters, one has at least the right to object to forms like "Kaernthen" (p. 125), "Nijmegen" (p. 151), and "Staufer" (p. 315), and to condemn "Friesians" (pp. 54, 101, etc.), "Clugny" (p. 329), "St. Bernhard" (p. 595) and "Raffaelle" (p. 653, followed two pages further on by "Titian") as quite without excuse. The same may be said of the use of "fodrum" (p. 222), "baillie" (p. 498), and "house-wealth" (p. 554).

As a guide to further study, the volume is notably deficient. "We have taken it for granted," the authors say, "that the teachers who may use the book are acquainted with the best literature on the period and will be able to direct the reading of their classes. The student for whom we are writing would be confused rather than helped by long lists of books, unless each book were accompanied by a discriminating estimate of its character and value;" and they content themselves with a reference to Adams's *Manual* and the lists in *Methods of Teaching and Studying History*, and an enumeration of a dozen general works "for the benefit of those who have no access to the above mentioned authors." It is hardly necessary to point out that those who are thus cut off are not likely to have within reach the forty-five volumes of Schroeck's *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* mentioned among the general works; the objections to this method of procedure lie deeper. What ground does experience furnish for assuming that the teachers who may use this book are acquainted with the best books of reference? And is it not one of the first duties of a manual of this sort to provide students with discriminating estimates of books? We appreciate the authors' objections to the mere piling of reference upon reference in history-teaching, but surely the remedy lies in judicious selection and not in the entire refusal of assistance. More attention should also have been given to the matter of sources ; the scattered citations are quite inadequate, and the absolute dependence of the historian upon original materials is not clearly brought out.

A thorough-going revision would do much to remedy the defects here pointed out ; in its present form *Europe in the Middle Age* does not meet all the demands which may properly be made of an elementary text-book.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

*Die Schlacht von Hastings.* By WILHELM SPATZ, Phil. D. (Berlin: Ebering. 1896. Pp. 69.)

THE reason avowed by Dr. Spatz for his publication of this treatise is the controversy that has raged about the battle of Hastings, since 1892,

in England. Whether his conclusions be accepted or not, students of history will at least welcome the appearance on the scene of a foreign writer, who approaches the subject with a fresh eye and from an absolutely impartial and independent standpoint. The fact that he has received, apparently, some assistance from Prof. Delbrück increases the interest of his views.

There is, it seems, a widespread impression that the whole dispute about the battle of Hastings (for Dr. Spatz agrees with me that we should so term it) is so involved and difficult that no one can hope to understand or arrive at any definite conclusion. It is, on the contrary, a simple matter, although it has been darkened by the importation of personal controversy and side-issues. Again, wonder has often been expressed that the details even of so famous an encounter should arouse such heated feeling. The simple explanation is that the dispute originated in an article not on the battle, but on "Professor Freeman,"<sup>1</sup> in which his authority and accuracy as an historian were openly impugned. In the reply to that article—"Professor Freeman and the Quarterly Review"<sup>2</sup>—Mr. Archer seized upon the battle of Hastings as a really vital point. I give my case in his own words:<sup>3</sup>

"On this occasion Mr. Freeman has not merely erred in detail; he is wrong, completely wrong in his whole conception of the battle . . . Such a contention, it will at once be perceived, is very different from any mere criticism of detail; it affects the centre and very heart of Mr. Freeman's work. If he could blunder here, in the most carefully elaborated passage of his whole history, he could blunder anywhere; his reputation for accuracy would be gone almost beyond hope of retrieving it."

The issue being thus clearly raised, it was no mere "palisade," or other feature of the battle, but Mr. Freeman's authority and accuracy as an historian that, according to his champion, were at stake. It is obviously not for me to say whether I have proved my case, but I would, at least, insist that I have dropped no part of it, and have, indeed, extended it since these words were written.<sup>4</sup>

Now, as for Dr. Spatz, I may tersely state the result of his investigations as follows: On the well-known points on which I differ from Mr. Freeman's narrative of the battle, he agrees with me absolutely and unreservedly. But he goes a good deal further than I do in rejecting portions of that narrative which I accept or do not dispute. Lastly, on the strategy of the little campaign, as apart from the tactics of the battle (with which alone I have dealt), he differs emphatically from Mr. Freeman. It will be best, therefore, to take these points separately. As to the first, he pronounces me undoubtedly right on what Mr. Archer deemed my two chief charges,<sup>5</sup> namely the existence of a palisade and the

<sup>1</sup> *Quarterly Review*, July, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> *Contemporary Review*, March, 1893, (Vol. LXIII).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 335-6.

<sup>4</sup> See *Quarterly Review*, July, 1893.

<sup>5</sup> "He [Mr. Freeman] is wrong above all things else in his disposition of the English troops. There were no palisades at Hastings," (*Cont. Rev.*, p. 335).

disposition of the English troops,<sup>1</sup> the latter being not only unauthorized, but opposed to analogy and probability. And these conclusions involve of necessity the collapse of Mr. Freeman's narrative. Moreover, he dismisses, as I do, the critical abandonment of its post by the English right as mere imagination (p. 57). It has, indeed, been publicly asserted that Dr. Spatz, while "rejecting the palisade interpretation" of the well-known passage in Wace by Mr. Freeman, "equally rejects Mr. Round's interpretation" that it refers to a shield-wall.<sup>2</sup> I am compelled to explain that this statement is doubly and directly contrary to fact. Dr. Spatz does not even discuss the interpretation of the passage, for the excellent reason that Wace's details are, as he insists, "historisch wertlos" (pp. 18-20). Moreover—and this is the essential point—it was Mr. Freeman himself, in his second and final edition, who, in the only place where he quotes or cites this passage, emphatically asserts that it describes "the array of the shield-wall" (III. 763-4). I agree with Dr. Spatz in his estimate of Wace; but if my opponents, as they do, take their stand upon his words, the "shield-wall" interpretation of them is, it will be seen, Mr. Freeman's own. To this, no answer is, or ever has been possible.

Turning to the new criticisms in this treatise, we find them practically based on the strange but dominant idea that both hosts were armed mobs who could only fight as individuals (*Einzelkämpfer*). It is on this ground that Dr. Spatz denies that the English were capable of forming the shield-wall or the Normans of executing the feigned flight. On the former I am, as I expressed it, "in complete agreement with Mr. Freeman;"<sup>3</sup> on the latter, Dr. Spatz is alone in questioning an episode described by William of Poitiers, his own leading authority. It is very significant that his strange notion makes him unable to suggest an intelligible formation for the English, among whom, he holds, the house-carls were but few in number. No one pretends that either host could execute elaborate tactical movements; but nothing could be simpler or more primitive than the movements assigned to the Norman knights or the stationary formation of the English.

The brief space at my disposal does not allow of my expressing any opinion on Dr. Spatz's view that the battle took place where it did by accident, the foresight claimed by Mr. Freeman for Harold being here treated with ridicule. Dr. Spatz, I gather, was unacquainted with the summary of my case in *Feudal England*, which might, on some points, have modified his views.

J. H. ROUND.

<sup>1</sup> "So muss die ganze Erzählung Freeman's über die englischen Befestigungen verworfen werden . . . Die Verteilung ist eine auf keinerlei Quellenangabe gestützte Vermutung Freemans," (p. 44).

<sup>2</sup> See Dean Stephen's letter in the *Athenæum*, December 19, 1896.

<sup>3</sup> *Feudal England*, pp. 354-5.